ACTIVE CASES
Analysis March 2004 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 86
        (drops excluded)

Totals for March 2004:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2004 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	16,276.00	14	1331.00	8.2%	7.4%
MILWAUKEE	7,126.00	8	872.00	12.2%	11.1%
BAL- STATE	9,150.00	6	459.00	5.0%	4.4%

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:
- **8-** Agency Preventable Errors
- **5-** Client Errors
- **1**- State: CS deducted from SS- not shown with mass change

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:
Of the 8 APES, five were in Milwaukee, and three in balance of state
Of the 5 client errors, three were in Milwaukee.

TYPES OF APE ERRORS (8):

Child Support Expense (1): agency failed to re-calculate CS expense at review.

Child Support Income: (1) ESS got an alert to check APCO and misinterpreted "last payment" field to mean payments ended.

Adopted Child (1): agency failed to change status of child upon being adopted. Agency budgeted adoption assistance payments as foster care. Child was not included as a mandatory FS group member.

Utilities (2): In one, the agency gave the heat SUA although there was none. In the second, agency failed to prorate utility expenses of ineligible alien to the FS group.

RegularEarned Income (1) : failed to end income from a job after customer reported at her review that the job ended.

Self-Employment Income (1): agency error in calculation and in interpretation of SE income policy.

Proration Error (1): application begin date was incorrect. Nothing to substantiate a signed FS request on the date the agency entered as the begin date.

TYPES OF CLIENT ERRORS (5 total):
Assets (1): client failed to report assets at application that were over program limits

Household Composition (1): -client failed to report persons in the home who had to be included in the FS group

Earnings (3): client failed to report new jobs at application or review.

STATE ERROR (1):
Customer had Child Support payments taken out of Social Security checks. This is very unusual occurrence and there is no mechanism for the mass CARES update of Social Security payments to show this. The smaller SS check amount is considered correct because it's from a trusted source. However the CS expense budgeted on AFSP should be zero because the expense cannot be allowed since it was from disregarded income. Part of the error was agency error since they had not updated the AFSP screen since 2002.

WHEN WERE THE APES MADE?

Of the 8 APES, 6 were made at re-certification, and 1 was at application, and one was at a reported change.

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

- **Location:** Five of the eight APES were from Milwaukee, and the other three were from Kenosha, Clark and Buffalo Counties.

- **Client errors:** All five were due to client failure to report correct information at application or review None were failure to report income exceeding the 130% FPL limit.

"BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for March 2004 (including client errors):

- **Vernon County, $175 Client Error**: The customer failed to report assets that were over the asset limit for the FS program. This alone would not be an error in the future since there is categorical eligibility for FS now. However this case would still have been a $175 error because the agency failed to recognize earnings as self-employment and didn't consider all the income for the business.

- **Milwaukee County, $156 Agency Preventable Error:** The Self-employment policy on acceptable income averaging was not followed by the agency.

- **Milwaukee County, $131 Client Error:** The client failed to report a new job at her FS application interview. While she had already worked a month it hadn't shown up in DILHR information available to the worker.

- mbw 07/26/04